REMARKS

Claims 8-24 are pending and are rejected. Claims 17-18 have been canceled. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 8-16 and 19-24 are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 9, 13, 18, and 24 have been objected to. Applicant has amended Claims 9, 13, and 24 to overcome these objections. Claim 18 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant has amended Claims 21 and 24 to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 8-11 and 17-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,524 to Turner et al. ("Turner"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 8

Applicants' Claim 8 recites in part:

updating a portion of the forwarding database to reflect
modifications made to the hierarchical tree structure, wherein the
updated portion corresponds to only those sub-databases affected
by the update operations

Turner fails to disclose or suggest the above recited limitation of Claim 8. Turner discloses an algorithm for building a database of tables whenever a new prefix is added or deleted (Turner, col. 17, lines 60-64). However, in contrast to Applicant's Claim 8, Turner discloses that the algorithm "processes the whole database whenever a new prefix is added or deleted" (Turner, col. 18, lines 24-25).

The Examiner has not pointed to any language in Turner that discloses or suggests "updating a portion of the forwarding database...wherein the updated portion corresponds to only those sub-databases affected by the update operations" as recited in Applicant's Claim 8.

To anticipate a claim under 35 USC §102, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed in a single reference[1]. The exclusion of a claimed element from a prior art reference is typically enough to negate anticipation under 35 USC §102. Thus, because Turner fails to disclose or suggest "updating a portion of the forwarding database...wherein the updated portion corresponds to only those sub-databases affected by the update operations" as recited in Applicant's Claim 8, Claim 8 is not anticipated by Turner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the rejection of Claim 8.

Claims 9-11 depend from Claim 8 and therefore distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 8.

Independent Claim 19

Applicants' Claim 19 recites in part:

updates a portion of the forwarding database to reflect modifications made to the hierarchical tree structure, wherein the updated portion corresponds to only those sub-databases affected by the update operations

As discussed above with respect to Claim 8, Turner fails to disclose or suggest an updating program that "updates a portion of the forwarding database...wherein the updated portion corresponds to only those sub-databases affected by the update operations." Accordingly, Claim 19 is not anticipated by Turner.

Claims 20-24 depend from Claim 19 and therefore distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 19.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,600 to Andreev et al. ("Andreev"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 12-16 depend from Claim 8 and therefore distinguish over the cited references for at least the same reasons as Claim 8.

---

1   Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Electric, 9 USPQ2d 1962, 1965 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Applicant hereby authorizes deposit account 50-1914 to be charged for any fees due in connection herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2007

/Greg Johnson/
Greg Johnson, Reg. No. 59,027
Tel. 408-236-6687